

DOCKET NO.: CM03351J

the first doped conducting region extends from the first support towards the first end of the beam shaped member; and
the resonating device further comprises:
a second support attached at approximately the center of the second longitudinal side of the beam shaped member; and
a second doped conducting region extending from the second support toward the second end of the beam shaped member; and
an insulating region between the first doped conducting region and the second doped conducting region.

58. (new) The electromechanical resonating device according to claim 40 wherein:

the selectively doped vibrating member is capable of resonating in a vibrational mode that includes the first node, a second node, and a third node; and
the resonating device further comprises;
a third support attached to the beam at the second node;
a fourth support attached to the beam at the third node.

REMARKS

The claims have been amended by rewriting claims 15, 25, 26, 33, 35, 37 and 39 canceling claims 16-18, 27-29, 34, 36, 38, 40-56 and adding new claims 57 and 58. Claims 15, and 19-26, and 30-33, 35, 37, 39, 57 and 58 remain in the application.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph:

Claims 25 and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 25 has been amended to correct the claim dependency. The rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is now overcome.

Dec. 12, 2003 4:46PM

No. 0494 P. 11

DOCKET NO.: CM03351J

Claim 33 has been amended to correct the claim dependency. The rejection of claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is now overcome.

Claim 35 has been amended to correct the claim dependency. The rejection of claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is now overcome.

DOCKET NO.: CM03351J

Allowable Subject Matter:

Claims 18, 23, 24, 29-31, 38 and 39 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all other limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter and have amended the claims accordingly.

- Independent claim 15 has been amended to include the elements of claims 16, 17 and 18 (now canceled) and thus claim 15 is in condition for allowance. Claims 19-25 are dependent claims that provide further limitations to allowable claim 15 and hence are also condition for allowance.

-The elements of dependent claim 23 have been incorporated into new independent claim 57, claim 57 is thus in condition for allowance.

-The elements of dependent claim 24 are iterated in new dependent claim 58, dependent claim 58 depends on an allowable claim 57 and hence is also in condition for allowance.

-Independent claim 26 has been amended to incorporate the elements of dependent claims 28 and 29 (now cancelled). Thus, amended claim 26 is in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 30-32 provide further limitations to allowable claim 26 and hence are also in condition for allowance.

- Claim 37 has been rewritten in independent format to include the elements of claim 38. thus claim 37, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Dependent claim 39 provides further limitation to an allowable claim 37 and hence is also in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, this application is believed to be in proper form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

US 1063644804P1



Creation date: 12-16-2003
Indexing Officer: TTRINH2 - THANH TRINH
Team: OIPEBackFileIndexing
Dossier: 10636448

Legal Date: 12-11-2003

No.	Doccode	Number of pages
1	ELC.	2

Total number of pages: 2

Remarks:

Order of re-scan issued on